



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ORIGIN AND STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

THE interest which in this country the Pentateuch has long continued to attract has caused the other historical books of the Old Testament to be comparatively neglected, in spite of the fact that the structure of these books is, speaking generally, much simpler and more obvious than that of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Commentaries continue to be written upon them in which the question of their composition is dealt with only vaguely and superficially. The following pages are an attempt to supply in part this deficiency in the case of the Book of Judges. They may be taken as exhibiting the view which the writer himself has formed of the origin and structure of the book after a careful comparison of what has been written upon it by the best and most recent authorities.<sup>1</sup>

The Book of Judges consists of three well defined portions : (1) an introduction i. 1—ii. 5, giving a view of the condition of the country at the time when the period of the Judges begins : (2) the history of the Judges ii. 6—xvi. : (3) an appendix xvii.—xxi., describing in some detail two incidents belonging to the period, viz., the migration of a part of the tribe of Dan to the north, xvii.—xviii., and the war of the Israelites against Benjamin, arising out of the outrage of Gibeah, xix.—xxi.

The structure of the Book is seen most clearly in the middle portion: it will be convenient therefore to begin with this. This history of the Judges, properly so called, consists essentially of a series of older narratives, fitted into a framework by a later editor, or redactor, and provided by him, where necessary, with introductory and concluding remarks. This editor, or

---

<sup>1</sup> The following are the authorities to whom the writer is chiefly indebted : Wellhausen, *Einleitung in das A. T.* (1878), p. 181-203 ; Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch Onderzoek*, &c. I. 2 (1887), pp. 332-367 ; Budde, *Josua und Richter in the Zeitsch. für die alt-test. Wissenschaft*, 1888, pp. 93-166 ; and Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, I. (1888), pp. 239 ff.

redactor, is imbued strongly with the spirit of Deuteronomy. His additions exhibit a phraseology and colouring different from that of the rest of the Book: all contain the same recurring expressions, and many are cast in the same type or form of words, so that they are recognisable without difficulty. Thus the history of each of the six greater Judges is fitted into a framework as follows—the details vary slightly, but the general resemblance is unmistakable. iii. 7—11 (Othniel), “And the children of Israel did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah, . . . and the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel, and he sold them into the hand of Chushan-rishathaim . . . and they served Chushan-rishathaim eight years; . . . and the children of Israel cried unto Jehovah, and he raised up unto them a saviour, . . . and the land had rest forty years.” iii. 12-30 (Ehud), “And the children of Israel again did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah, and Jehovah strengthened Eglon king of Moab against Israel, . . . and they served Eglon eighteen years; . . . and the children of Israel cried unto Jehovah, and Jehovah raised up to them a saviour; . . . and Moab was subdued, . . . and the land had rest forty years.” iv. 1—v. 31, “And the children of Israel again did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah, and Jehovah sold them into the hand of Jabin, . . . and for twenty years he mightily oppressed them; . . . so God subdued Jabin (iv. 23), . . . and the land had rest forty years” (v. 31). The scheme is similar in the case of Gideon (vi. 1-7; viii. 28), Jephthah (x. 6, 7, 10; xi. 33<sup>b</sup>; xii. 7), Samson (xiii. 1; xv. 20 [twenty years], xvi. 31 *end*). In all we have the same succession of apostasy, subjugation, the cry for help, deliverance, described often in the same, always in similar, phraseology. Let the reader notice how frequently at or near the *beginning* and *close* of the narrative of each of the greater Judges the following expressions occur: *did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah, sold<sup>1</sup> them or delivered them into the hand of . . . , cried unto Jehovah, subdued, and the land had rest . . .* (iii. 7, 8, 9, 11; iii. 12, 15, 30; iv. 1, 2, 3, 23; v. 31<sup>b</sup>; vi. 1, 6<sup>b</sup>; viii. 28; x. 6, 7; xi. 33<sup>b</sup>; xiii. 1, 16, 31 *end*). Clearly in the body of the book a series of independent narratives has been taken by the compiler and arranged by him in a framework, designed with the object of stating the chronology of the period, and exhibiting a theory of the occasion and nature of the work which the Judges generally were called to undertake.

---

<sup>1</sup> This figure is almost peculiar to the compiler of this book (ii. 14; iii. 8; iv. 2; x. 7; rather differently in the older narrative iv. 9), and the kindred author of 1 Sam. xii. (verse 9): it is derived probably from Deut. xxxii. 30 (the Song).

In the case of the six Minor Judges (Shamgar, Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon) detailed particulars were probably not accessible to the compiler; hence the narratives are much briefer, though there is great similarity in the literary form in which they are cast (iii. 31; x. 1-2; 3-5; xii. 8-10; 11-12; 13-15).

But the history of the Judges proper has been provided by the compiler with an introduction ii. 6—iii. 6, which must next be examined. Is this introduction the work of the compiler also? In parts of it, we trace his hand at once (ii. 11, 12, 14; in 16, 18, 19 also notice the expressions *raised up*, *saved*, *oppressed*, comparing iii. 9, 15; iv. 3; vi. 9; x. 12, 13, and the general similarity of tone). But the whole cannot be his work, for ii. 6-9 is repeated with slight verbal differences from Josh. xxiv. 28, 31, 29, 30 (LXX., 28, 29, 30, 31); elsewhere *the point of view is different*, and the details harmonize imperfectly with each other, authorising the inference that he has here incorporated in his work *older materials*. Thus ii. 23 cannot be the original sequel of ii. 20-22; the fact that the Canaanites were not delivered "into the hand of Joshua" (23) cannot be a consequence of what happened (ii. 21) *after Joshua's death*. In iii. 1-3, the ground for which the Canaanites were not driven out is that the Israelites might learn the art of war; in ii. 22 and iii. 4 it is that they might be tested *morally*, that it might be seen whether they would adhere to the service of Jehovah or not. The list of nations in iii. 3 is scarcely consistent with that in iii. 5; the nations named in iii. 3 are just those occupying *particular* districts in or near Canaan, the six named in iii. 5 are representative of the *entire* population of Western Palestine.<sup>1</sup> The oldest part of this section is no doubt iii. 1-3, describing how the Israelites became trained in warfare through the inhabitants of particular districts continuing to dwell among or near them; and it has been plausibly conjectured that these verses formed once the sequel to chap. i. (where the *fact* of such inhabitants being left is described); in this case the expression, *all* the Canaanites (which would be untrue, if taken absolutely) receives its natural limitation; it will be limited to the Canaanites named in the context of ch. i., viz., the people of Gezer, Dor, Megiddo, Taanach, Beth-Shean, &c. (i. 29-33). Thus looking at ii. 6—iii. 6 as a whole we may analyse it as follows:—ii. 6-10 (repeated, except verse 10, from Joshua) describes the death of Joshua, and the change which in the view of the compiler came over the nation in the following generation; ii. 11-19 states the compiler's theory of the period of the Judges—a theory to be exemplified in detail in

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ex. xxxiii. 2; Deut. vii. 1; Josh. ix. 1, &c.

the special narratives following, and to which they are expressly adapted by means of the introduction and other additions of the compiler, as explained above; ii. 20-22 deals with a different subject, not the nations *around* Israel as 11-19, but the nations *in their midst*, who, through the disobedience of the Israelites during the same period, viz. after Joshua's death, were still to be left for the purpose of testing their moral strength; the sequel of ii. 20-22 is iii. 5-6, stating how the Israelites intermarried with the Canaanites, and thus failed to endure the test. iii. 1-3 is the older fragment, enumerating the nations that were instrumental in training Israel in warfare; when this was incorporated, ii. 23 (attaching loosely and imperfectly to ii. 22) was prefixed as an introduction, and iii. 4 appended, for the purpose of leading back to the general thought of ii. 20-22 and its sequel iii. 5-6. In its original form iii. 1-3 was probably shorter than it now is; even an English reader can perceive that the verses iii. 1-2 are inelegantly expressed and overfilled; no doubt, in the process of incorporation, slight additions were made to them by the compiler.

It is not impossible that x. 6-16, the introduction to the narrative of Jephthah, which is much longer than the other introductions, may also be the expansion of an earlier and briefer narrative, to which in particular vv. 6<sup>b</sup>, 8 (partly), 10, 13-16 may belong. The particulars in 17 and 18 appear to be simply derived from c. xi., and prefixed here as an introduction, after the notice of the Ammonites in x. 7, 8.<sup>1</sup> That the author of c. xi. wrote independently of x. 6-18, and could not have had these verses before him, appears from the wording of xi. 4, which as it stands, is evidently the *first* mention of the Ammonites, and must have been differently expressed, had x. 6, 8 already preceded. x. 6-16, 17-18, was therefore written *after* c. xi., and prefixed to it as an introduction.

Was the compiler, however, or, as in view of his prevalent thought and tone we may more distinctively term him, the *Deuteronomic compiler* of the book, the first who arranged together the separate narratives of the Judges? or had this been already done, and was the basis of his work a continuous narrative of the Judges, which he fitted into his own framework, in the manner that has been indicated above? There are grounds for thinking the latter alternative the true one. Some of the narratives are not adapted to illustrate the theory of the Judges, as expounded in ii. 11-19; so, for instance, the

---

<sup>1</sup> So in c. viii., the contents of verses 30, 31, 35, seem derived from c. ix., and placed where they now stand, as a link of connexion between Gideon (c. viii.) and Abimelech (c. ix.).

accounts of the minor Judges (iii. 31; x. 1-5; xii. 8-15), in which no allusion is made to the nation's apostasy, but which, nevertheless, as remarked above, are cast mainly in the same mould, and the narrative of Abimelech in c. ix.: a lesson is indeed deduced from the history of Abimelech, ix. 24, 56, 57, but not the lesson of ii. 11-19. It is very possible, therefore, that there was a *pre-Deuteronomic collection* of histories of Judges, which the Deuteronomic compiler set in a new framework, prefixing the introduction, ii. 6-9, from Joshua, adding the verses ii. 10, 11-19, &c. (stating his own theory of the history of the period), and accommodating thereto the following narratives by the addition of introductory and concluding remarks, declaring the ground of the oppression in the people's apostasy, and indicating the motive and results of the deliverance which followed.

Perhaps one or two of the recurring phrases noted above, such as "subdued" (iii. 30; iv. 23; viii. 28; xi. 33), which seem to form a more integral part of the narratives proper than the rest, may mark the portions due to the pre-Deuteronomic compiler. There is also a more noticeable feature of the book which may be rightly attributed to him. It is clear that the Judges were, in fact, merely local heroes; they formed temporary heads in particular centres, or over particular groups of tribes—Barak in the north of Israel; Gideon in the centre; Jephthah on the east of Jordan; Samson in the extreme south-west. Nevertheless, the Judges are consistently represented as exercising jurisdiction over Israel as a whole (iii. 8; iv. 4; ix. 22; x. 2, 3; xii. 8, 9; xvi. 31 and elsewhere); and this generalisation of their position and influence is so associated with the individual narratives that it must have formed a feature in them before they came into the hands of the Deuteronomic compiler; hence, if it was not a conception shared in common by the original authors, it must have been a trait due to the first compiler of this portion of the book. The question, however, whether the Deuteronomic compiler had before him a number of separate narratives, or a continuous work, is of secondary importance. Some may consider the grounds adduced in favour of *two* compilers insufficient; and the important distinction is undoubtedly that between the narratives generally and the framework—whether treated as the work of one compiler or of two—in which they are set.

Considering, then, ii. 6 to xvi. as a whole, we may say that the parts which either belong wholly to the Deuteronomic compiler, or consist of elements which have been expanded or largely recast by him, are—ii. 11-22; iii. 5-6, 7-11 (almost entirely: there are no *details* of Othniel's judgeship such

as constitute the narratives respecting Ehud, Barak, etc.); 12-15<sup>a</sup>, 30<sup>b</sup>; iv. 1-3; v. 31<sup>b</sup>; vi. 1, 7-10<sup>1</sup>; viii. 27<sup>b</sup> (probably), 28<sup>b</sup>, 33-34, 35 (based on c. ix.); x. 6-16, 17f. (based on c. xi.); xiii. 1, 15, 20; xvi. 31<sup>b</sup>. All these parts are connected together by a similarity of tone and phraseology, distinct from that which prevails in any other part of this division of the book, which stamps them as the work of a single hand—not that of the author (or authors) of the histories of the several Judges, but of a compiler arranging, and accommodating to a plan of his own, a series of pre-existent narratives.

We may now pass to the first division of the book, i. 1—ii. 5. This is of a very different complexion from the division which we have just been considering. It consists of fragments of an old account of the conquest of Canaan—not by united Israel under the leadership of Joshua, but—by the individual efforts of the separate tribes. The fragments, however, narrate the positive successes of Judah and Simeon (i. 1-21) and the “House of Joseph” (22-26) only. There follows a series of notices describing how particular tribes, viz., Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, and Dan, failed to dispossess the native inhabitants. By the opening words: “And it came to pass after the death of Joshua,” the section is attached to the Book of Joshua, and the events narrated in it are assigned to the period after the close of the book. But it has long been suspected<sup>2</sup> that these words are, in fact, merely a redactional addition, and that the account is, in reality, *parallel*, at least in part, with the narrative in Joshua, and not a continuation of it. The Book of Joshua (as we now have it) describes how the whole land was subdued by the Israelites, and taken possession of by the individual tribes (see *e.g.* xxi. 43-45; xxiii. 1). In Jud. i. the Israelites are still at Gilgal, (ii. 1); or close by at Jericho (i. 16): and hence the tribes “go up” (*i.e.* from the Jordan Valley to the high ground of Judah), as at the beginning of the Book of Joshua (v. 9), Judah first, to conquer their respective territories (i. 1, 2, 3).

How far this representation of the course of events can be reconciled with the Book of Joshua, cannot now be considered in detail; but it may be remarked that our existing Book of Joshua has assumed its present form by a series of stages, and is composed of distinct strata of narrative, superposed one upon another, the oldest of which (to which Josh. xxi. 43—45;

<sup>1</sup> Assigned by Budde (*Z. A. T. W.*, 1888, p. 232) to the Hexateuchal narrator E. Certainly the phraseology is not throughout that of the Deuteronomic compiler, and exhibits affinities with the parts of Josh. xxiv. which belong to E.

<sup>2</sup> Compare the Bishop of Bath and Wells in the “Speaker’s Commentary,” ii. p. 123f.

xxiii. 1 do not belong) do not represent the conquest as by any means so complete as the generalising expressions peculiar to the later strata appear to imply. In fact, it is remarkable that in these older strata of the Book of Joshua, there occur a series of passages, some identical (except for verbal variations) with parts of Judges i., and others resembling them strongly in representation and phraseology. Thus Jud. i. 21 (stating that the Benjaminites did not expel the Jebusites of Jerusalem) agrees almost precisely with Josh. xv. 63, the only material difference being that the failure is there laid to the charge not of Benjamin but of *Judah*; <sup>1</sup> i. 20<sup>b</sup>, 10<sup>b</sup>—15 agrees with Josh. xv. 14—19; i. 27—28 corresponds with Josh. xvii. 12—13; i. 29 with Josh. xvi. 10. Most of the verbal differences are due simply to the different relations which the fragments hold in the two books to the contiguous narrative. Josh. xvii. 14—18 (the complaint of the tribe of Joseph of the insufficient size of their inheritance and Joshua's instructions to them to exert themselves to increase it), and xix. 47 (Dan) are very similar in representation (implying the *separate* action taken by individual tribes), and in phraseology.<sup>2</sup> It can hardly be doubted that both Jud. i. and these notices in Joshua are excerpts from what was once a detailed survey of the conquest of Canaan; of these excerpts some have been fitted in with the narrative of Joshua, others have been combined in Jud. i., so as to form with the addition of the opening words *after the death of Joshua*, an introduction to the period of the Judges. The survey is incomplete, but the parts which remain may be combined together, somewhat as follows: Jud. i. 1<sup>b</sup> (from "and the children of Israel asked" etc.)—3, 5-7, 19, 21 (=Josh. xv. 63); Josh. xv. 13-19 (=Jud. i. 20, 10-15); Jud. i. 16, 17, 36<sup>3</sup>, 22-26; Josh. xvii. 14-18; xiii. 13; Jud. i. 27-28 (=Josh. xvii. 12 [the names of the towns are stated in ver. 11 and so not repeated]—13), 29 (=Josh. xvi. 10); 30-33, 34; Josh. xix. 47; Jud. i. 35.<sup>4</sup> The representation

<sup>1</sup> Jerusalem lay on the border between Judah and Benjamin: the later theory (Josh. xviii. 28) assigned it to Benjamin; no doubt, therefore, *Judah* is the original reading, and represents the original tradition.

<sup>2</sup> Notice "House of Joseph" (unusual), Josh. xvii. 17; Jud. i. 22, 23, 25; "daughters" for dependent towns, Josh. xvii. 11, 16; Jud. i. 27; "*would dwell*," Josh. xvii. 12; Jud. i. 27, 35; the "chariots of iron," Josh. xvii. 16; Jud. i. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Where it is highly probable that *Amorites* is an error for *Edomites*.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Kittel, pp. 239 ff, who, in agreement mainly with Budde, offers a comparative estimate of the chief textual variations between such of the notices as are parallel. Jud. i. 8 contradicts the uniform tradition respecting the conquest of Jerusalem; it is probably an incorrect gloss, due to a misunderstanding of ver. 7 (as though the pronoun "they" denoted the Israelites rather than the people of Adonibezek), and intended to explain how the Israelites were able to take Adonibezek to Jerusalem.



in ii. 1<sup>a</sup> (of which it is probable that the original sequel was 5<sup>b</sup>) is an unusual one, but is in accordance with Ex. xxiii. 20; the "angel" meant must be the one which according to this passage was to conduct the Israelites to their rest in Canaan; and the meaning of the words will be that the chief centre of the "Tent of Meeting," which had been hitherto at Gilgal, was now advanced to Bochim (*i.e.* probably Bethel, as is actually read by the LXX. in ver. 1). Perhaps the words are a fragment of an account of the movements of the Israelites, in which the angel of Jehovah was a more prominent figure than is the case in the records which we at present possess (comp. Num. x. 33; Deut. i. 33).

The *third* division of the Book differs again in character from either of the other two. It consists of two continuous narratives, not describing the exploits of any Judge, but relating two incidents belonging to the same period of history. Ch. xvii.-xviii. introduces us to an archaic state of Israelitish life: the tribe of Dan (xviii. 1) is still without a possession in Canaan; Micah's "house of God" with its instruments of divination, the "ephod and the teraphim," and its owner's satisfaction at securing a Levite as his priest (xvii. 5-13), are set before us vividly; nor does any disapproval of what Micah had instituted appear to be expressed. The narrative as a whole exhibits the particulars of what is briefly mentioned in one of the notices just referred to, Josh. xix. 47, though the latter can scarcely be derived from it on account of the different orthography of the name Laish.<sup>1</sup> The two chapters contain indications which have led some<sup>2</sup> to suppose that they have been formed—as is often the case in the Pentateuch—by the combination of two parallel narratives. But the inference is here a questionable one, and it is rejected by Kuenen,<sup>3</sup> who will only admit that in two or three places the narrative is in disorder or has suffered interpolation.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In Josh. Leshem, which however should probably be vocalised *Lêshâm*, which might be a by-form of *Laish*: compare the names *Êtâm* (derived from *ait*) and *Enâm* (from *ain*).

<sup>2</sup> Vatke, Bertheau, most recently Budde (*Z. A. T. W.*, 1888, pp. 285—292).

<sup>3</sup> *Onderzoek* (1887), p. 358-9, (written, however, as the date shows, before the appearance of Budde's Essay).

<sup>4</sup> Thus the *two* chronological notes, xviii. 30, 31, cannot both be by one hand; and had ver. 30 been by the same author as the narrative as a whole, the name of the Levite would almost certainly have been stated where he was first mentioned xvii. 7 ff. Ver. 30 is a notice added by a later hand, intended to supplement the preceding narrative by stating particulars in which it appeared to be deficient. The "day of the captivity (properly *exile*) of the land" can only denote the exile of the ten tribes in 722 B.C. Mr. Lias, in his explanation of the expression, has been misled by the English word *captivity*, and has forgotten to consult Hebrew usage.

In the second narrative (ch. xix.—xxi.) the account (c. xix.) of the outrage perpetrated upon the Levite's concubine in Gibeah offers for our present purpose no materials for comment. Ch. xx., however, is the puzzle of the entire Book. Not only does the description in parts appear to be in duplicate—compare vers. 36<sup>b</sup>—46 with 29—36<sup>a</sup><sup>1</sup>; but the account, precisely as we have it, can scarcely be historical. The figures are incredibly large: Deborah (v. 8) places the number of warriors in *entire* Israel at not more than 40,000; here 400,000 advance against 25,000 + 700 Benjaminites, and the latter slay of the former on the first day 22,000, on the second 18,000; on these two days not one of the 25,000 + 700 Benjaminites falls, but on the third day 10,000 Israelites slay 25,100 of them! (xx. 2, 15 R.V. marg., 17, 21, 25, 34, 35). Secondly, whereas in the rest of the Book the tribes are represented uniformly as acting separately, and only combining temporarily and partially, in this narrative Israel is represented as entirely centralised, assembling and taking action *as one man* (xx. 1, 8, 11: similarly xxi. 2, 5, 10, 13, 16), with an unanimity which, in fact, was only gained—and that imperfectly—after the establishment of the monarchy. This joint action of the “congregation” contradicts the notices of all except the initial stages in the conquest of Palestine, not less than the picture exhibited elsewhere of the condition of Israel during this period. The motives prompting the people's action, and the manner in which they are collected together, are unlike what appears in any other part of either Judges or Samuel: elsewhere the people are impelled to action by the initiative of an individual leader; here they move, in vast numbers, automatically; there is not even mention of the head who must have been needful for the purpose of directing the military operations. However keenly the rest of Israel may have felt its indignation aroused by the deed of Gibeah, and the readiness of the Benjaminites to screen the perpetrators (xx. 13), the combination can hardly have taken place on the scale depicted. Nor is there any trace either in Judges (v. 14)—(if this incident, comp. xx. 27,<sup>2</sup> be prior to the

<sup>1</sup> Compare ver. 31 and ver. 39 (in both thirty Israelites smitten); ver. 35 (25,100 Benjaminites smitten) and vers. 44, 45, 46 (18,000 + 5,000 + 2,000 = 25,000 smitten): the *whole* number of Benjaminites, as stated in ver. 15, was but 25,000 + 700.

<sup>2</sup> Which, however, is pretty clearly a gloss added for the purpose of explaining how the people were able to inquire of Jehovah, and so no real indication of the period to which the incident was assigned by the original narrator. Not only do the words 27<sup>b</sup>—28<sup>a</sup>, where they stand, interrupt the sentence awkwardly, but they are inserted in the wrong place: had they been an explanation made by the original narrator, they would clearly have stood in ver. 18, the *first* occasion when the inquiry was made.

time of Deborah)—or in Samuel—if it be subsequent to it—of the tribe of Benjamin having been reduced to one-fortieth of its numbers, or in the narrative of 1 Samuel xi. of the virtual extermination (xxi. 10-11) of the population of Jabesh Gilead.

These difficulties, it will be noticed, attach to ch. xx.-xxi., not to ch. xix. The truth appears to be that ch. xx.-xxi. are not homogeneous; parts are decidedly later than ch. xix., and exhibit to us the tradition respecting the action of the Israelites against Benjamin in the shape which it had assumed in the course of a long period of oral transmission. The story of the vengeance taken by the Israelites against the guilty tribe offered scope for expansion and embellishment, as it was handed on in the mouth of the people; and the literary form in which we have it exhibits the last stage of the process. Hence the exaggeration both in the numbers, and in the scale upon which the tribes combined and executed their vengeance upon Benjamin and Jabesh Gilead. The narrative of the outrage in ch. xix. is old: in style and representation it exhibits resemblances with ch. xvii., xviii.; and in all probability it has come down to us with very little, if any, alteration of form. The narrative of the vengeance, on the contrary, in ch. xx., has been expanded; as it was first written down, the incidents were simpler, and the scale on which they were represented as having taken place, was smaller than is now the case. But the original narrative has been combined with the additions in such a manner that it cannot be disengaged with certainty, and is now, in all probability, as Kuenen admits, not recoverable.<sup>1</sup> In ch. xxi. the narrative of the rape of the maidens at Shiloh wears the appearance of antiquity, and stands, no doubt, on the same footing as ch. xix. But parts of vers. 5-14 contain expressions that are not usual in the historical books, and here there is reason to suppose that the original narrative has been expanded or otherwise modified. It may be noticed that the remark, "In those days there was no king in Israel," connects the two narratives of the appendix together (xvii. 6; xviii. 1; xix. 1; xxi. 25; in xvii. 6 and xxi. 25, with the addition, "every man did that which was right in his own eyes"): this, from its character, must certainly be pre-exilic, and stamps the narratives of which it forms part as pre-exilic likewise.

---

<sup>1</sup> The attempt of Bertheau, in his commentary, is admitted to depend upon insufficient criteria. Budde in the *Z. A. T. W.*, 1888, p. 296 ff., proposes an analysis which is more plausible, though it is scarcely offered by its author, except as a tentative solution of the problem which the chapter presents.

In ch. xix.-xxi. the phrase belongs to that part of the narrative, which there are independent reasons for supposing to be earlier than the rest. The object of the narrative in its present form appears to have been to give an *ideal* representation of the community as inspired throughout by a keen sense of right, and as acting harmoniously in concert for the purpose of giving effect to the dictates of morality.

It is to be observed that in the first and third divisions of the book no traces are to be found of the hand of the Deuteronomic redactor of the middle division; there are no marks either of his distinctive phraseology or of his view of the history, as set forth in ii. 11-19. Hence it is probable that these divisions did not pass through his hand; but were added to the book as he left it (ii. 6—xvi.) as an introduction and appendix, respectively, by a later hand. This inference is confirmed by further indications. Compare i. 1 with ii. 6—10; would one and the same writer have given *two* introductions, each attaching independently to the preceding Book of Joshua? Would a writer, again, who adopted ii. 6—9 from Joshua, have prefixed ch. i. with its divergent representation of the course of the conquest? ii. 21f. also would probably have been differently worded had these verses been preceded by ii. 1—3; and iii. 5, if it had been preceded by ch. i. Looking at the book as a whole, then, we conclude that i. 1-ii. 5, and ch. xvii.-xxi., derived from distinct and independent sources, were *added* to the history of the Judges in ii. 6—xvi., after it had assumed its present shape through the work of the Deuteronomic redactor, by a separate hand.

The historical value of the Book of Judges has been so justly estimated by Prof. A. B. Davidson, that we cannot forbear citing a few extracts from what he has written.<sup>1</sup> After remarking on the difference in point of view between the histories and the framework, he continues, "This regular movement of apostasy, subjugation, penitence, and deliverance, is hardly strict history. It is rather the religious philosophy of the history. It is a summary of the historical movements written under the idea that Jehovah presided in the history of Israel; and to bring it down to our level we must read second causes into the movements and the operations of the people's mind. . . . The author speaks of Israel as an ideal unity, and attributes to this unity defection, which no doubt characterised only fragments of the whole." . . . "The histories preserved in the book are, for the most part, external;

---

<sup>1</sup> In an article on the Prophetess Deborah, in *The Expositor*, January, 1887, pp. 48-50.

they are probably traditions preserved among the individual tribes who played the chief part in the events described. That in some instances we have duplicates exhibiting divergences in details is natural, and does not detract from the general historical worth of the whole. The story of Deborah is given in a prose form (ch. iv.) as well as in the poem, and the divergences can be accounted for only on the supposition that ch. iv. is an independent tradition." We have here only space to consider briefly two of the separate histories from a literary point of view.

In the narrative of Deborah and Barak (ch. iv., v.), the song (ch. v.) is a contemporary historical document of the highest possible value; but the narrative (ch. iv.), when compared attentively with it, is seen to exhibit divergences in detail which show that it is founded on an independent tradition, which in process of transmission has become slightly modified. The song speaks of a combination of *kings* of Canaan (v. 19), of whom Sisera is the head—his mother (v. 29) is attended by *princesses*<sup>1</sup>; ch. v. speaks of Jabin, who is described as himself "King of Canaan," reigning at Hazor, and of Sisera, his general. Further, while in ch. iv. Deborah dwells at Bethel in Ephraim, and Barak at Kedesh in Naphtali, and, in addition to his own tribe, summons only Zebulun (ch. iv. 10), in ch. v. 15 both leaders are brought into close connection with Issachar, and the language employed creates at least the *impression* that they belonged to that tribe. In v. 14, 15, 18, Ephraim, Benjamin, Machir (*i.e.*, Manasseh), and Issachar, as well as Zebulun and Naphtali, are alluded to as assisting in the struggle. No doubt the points of agreement between the narrative and the poem are greater than the points of divergence—*e.g.*, both describe similarly the deed of Jael—but, nevertheless, there is sufficient divergence to show that the narrative embodies a tradition which had become modified, and in parts obscured, in the course of oral transmission. In fact, it is not impossible that tradition (as is its wont) may have combined two distinct occurrences, and that, with the victory of Barak and Deborah over the kings of Canaan and Sisera at their head, may have been intermingled elements belonging properly to an old Israelitish victory over Jabin, a king in the far north of Palestine, reigning at Hazor. Of course, these elements are subordinate in ch. iv., and in so far as Sisera is still the prominent figure in it, the tradition which it embodies preserves a true recollection of the facts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not "ladies" (A. V.). See 1 Kings xi. 3 (of Solomon's queens); Is. xlix. 23.

In the narrative of Jephthah, ch. xi., xii., the only part which calls for comment is ch. xi. 12—28, the account of the message sent by Jephthah to the Ammonites. Here, in answer to the Ammonites' complaint that the Israelites had taken possession of their land between Arnon and Jabbok, Jephthah is made to show that the territory in question belonged at the time of the Exodus to Sihon, the king of the Amorites, and that thus the Israelites had occupied his land, not *Moabite* land. Balak, king of *Moab*, did not fight against Israel,<sup>1</sup> why should Ammon? It is remarkable that the precedents, though addressed to Ammon, are drawn from the history of *Moab*. Even Chemosh—elsewhere always the god of *Moab*—is described as giving the Ammonites their territory. The passage reads like an insertion in the original narrative; at any rate, Jephthah's message has been expanded by the writer on the basis of materials derived from the narrative "JE" of the Pentateuch, with which it frequently agrees *verbatim*. (With verses 17—22, 26, compare Numbers xx. 14, 17; xxi. 4, 13, 21—24, 25.) Its terms do not, however, as Mr. Lias strangely argues, "show the Pentateuch to have been in existence in Jephthah's day." It is the habitual practice of the Old Testament historians to cast the speeches, especially long ones, attributed by them to historical characters, into their own phraseology, and often, also, to colour them with the ideas and principles current in their own day. Thus many of the speeches in Kings bear clear marks of having been cast into form by the compiler of those books; and the same fact is even more evident in the case of the Chronicles, where, for instance, the speech and prayer attributed to David in 1 Chronicles xxix. abound with the idioms and ideas peculiar to the Chronicler's own age and style. Thus all that the present passage shows is that the particular Pentateuchal source to which the context of Numb. xx., 14, etc., belongs, was in existence at the time *when the author of the passage wrote himself*. That the narrative of Jephthah is in substance thoroughly historical, is not questioned, even by Kuenen.<sup>2</sup>

S. R. DRIVER.

---

<sup>1</sup> A statement which does not harmonize with Josh. xxiv. 9, "Then Balak, the son of Zippor, king of Moab, arose and fought against Israel."

<sup>2</sup> *Onderzoek*, p. 344.